1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
67	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8		
9	JAMES G WILBUR,	CASE NO. C15-5543 RBL
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING IFP AND COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL
11	v.	[Dkt. #1]
12	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF	[DKI. #1]
	INTERIOR,	
13	Defendant.	
14		intiff Wilbur's Motion to proceed <i>in forma</i>
14 15	Defendant.	
14 15 16	Defendant. THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims
14 15 16 17	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla pauperis and for court–appointed counsel. [Dkt. =	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims imprisoned" at the Makah Detention Facility
114 115 116 117 118	Defendant. THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla pauperis and for court–appointed counsel. [Dkt. == relate to injuries he suffered while he was "falsely	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims imprisoned" at the Makah Detention Facility
114	Defendant. THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla pauperis and for court–appointed counsel. [Dkt. = relate to injuries he suffered while he was "falsely "May 7, 2011 through March 8, 2012." He specific	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims imprisoned" at the Makah Detention Facility ically claims he was injured and hospitalized in
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla pauperis and for court–appointed counsel. [Dkt. relate to injuries he suffered while he was "falsely "May 7, 2011 through March 8, 2012." He specific May 2011.	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims imprisoned" at the Makah Detention Facility ically claims he was injured and hospitalized in the toproceed in forma pauperis upon
114 115 116 117 118 119 120 221	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla pauperis and for court–appointed counsel. [Dkt. relate to injuries he suffered while he was "falsely "May 7, 2011 through March 8, 2012." He specific May 2011. A district court may permit indigent litigan	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims imprisoned" at the Makah Detention Facility ically claims he was injured and hospitalized in its to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> upon 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The court has broad
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Pla pauperis and for court—appointed counsel. [Dkt. in relate to injuries he suffered while he was "falsely" "May 7, 2011 through March 8, 2012." He specific May 2011. A district court may permit indigent litigate completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See	#1] Wilbur is an enrolled Makah. His claims imprisoned" at the Makah Detention Facility ically claims he was injured and hospitalized in its to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> upon 228 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The court has broad vilege of proceeding <i>in forma pauperis</i> in civil

in forma pauperis at the outset if it appears from the face of the proposed complaint that the action is frivolous or without merit." Tripati v. First Nat'l Bank & Trust, 821 F.2d 1368, 1369 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). An in forma pauperis complaint is frivolous if "it ha[s] no arguable substance in law or fact." *Id.* (citing *Rizzo v*. Dawson, 778 F.2d 527, 529 (9th Cir. 1985); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1228 (9th Cir. 1984). Wilbur cannot meet this is standard. In this state, a §1983 claim must be commenced within three years of the date the claim accrues. Wilbur's claims were tolled while he was incarcerated (RCW 4.16.190) but it accrued when he was released—in March 2012. §1983 itself contains no statute of limitations. Federal courts instead "borrow" §1983 limitations periods from analogous state law. Specifically, they borrow the state's "general or residual statute for personal injury actions." Owens v Okure, 488 U.S. 235, 250 (1989). In Washington, that statute is RCW 4.16.080(2), which is a three-year limitations period. Bagley v CMC Realty Corp., 923 F.2d 758, 760 (9th Cir. 1991). The court should "deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis at the outset if it appears from the face of the proposed complaint that the action is frivolous or without merit." Tripati v. First Nat'l Bank & Trust, 821 F.2d 1368, 1369 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). An in forma pauperis complaint is frivolous if "it ha[s] no arguable substance in law or fact." Id. (citing Rizzo v. Dawson, 778 F.2d 527, 529 (9th Cir. 1985); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1228 (9th Cir. 1984). Wilbur's claims are facially, fatally flawed, and thus frivolous, and he fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. He is not entitled to in forma pauperis status under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii). Because he cannot cure the timeliness defect, Wilbur's in 24

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

forma pauperis application is denied and he must pay the filing fee within 21 days or the case will be dismissed. The Plaintiff is warned that even if he pays the filing fee, the case is subject to dismissal as time-barred. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), the court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel. Under §1915, the court may appoint counsel in exceptional circumstances. Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984). To find exceptional circumstances, the court must evaluate the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the petitioner to articulate the claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). Wilbur cannot demonstrate any likelihood of success on his facially time-barred claims, and his Motion for a court-appointed attorney is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 21st day of September, 2015. Ronald B. Leighton United States District Judge

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24